

be sued; so that while he highly commended the plan, he would not participate in it himself.

2. The second letter was written by a member living less than twenty miles from the residence of the writer of the first letter, and was written in great agitation of mind. The writer stated that he had been in practise 26 years, that he had always been careful and faithful in his work, but that the day before he had been served with papers in a suit demanding \$20,000 damages. Unfortunately for the writer of this second letter, he had not paid his dues to his county society at the time he treated the patient suing him, and therefore he was obliged to defend the suit at his own expense.

"No man knoweth the day or the hour."

THE INDEMNITY FUND.

On October 17th, the date of writing, 212 members had contributed to the indemnity insurance fund. With these contributions have come volumes of comment, practically all favorable, and much of it very enthusiastic. One inquiry is directly pertinent. Why does the plan request the sending of a note, and why does not the note state the purpose?

The first point here may be answered by saying that the object of requiring a payment for each of two consecutive years, cash for the first payment and the note for the second, is to maintain the interest of the contributors in the first place, and in the second, to distribute the money payment over two years and not concentrate it in one payment of \$30.

The second question may be answered by saying that a promissory note, to be a negotiable document, must be an unconditional promise to pay a certain sum of money to order of bearer. Any alteration of the form of the note immediately destroys its negotiability.

Just a few of the expressions used by those who have contributed are here appended, as they reflect the tone of all of the contributors so far:

"This is a good thing for the members and they ought to stand together—it is nearly always some one that never paid a doctor a cent in his life that is trying to gouge him."

"I am now in my 76th year and have not practiced for some years, so do not need this protection though I am greatly interested in the project, and if it were otherwise I would surely help the matter along, if for nothing else, for the benefit of others. It seems to me that the profession should by all means protect itself through some agency of this kind."

Here is an illustration of what is probably going on in the case of several hundred of our members: "I had fully intended at the start to send this without further ado, but, like most doctors, I neglected it. I am certainly very heartily in sympathy with the movement and believe it to be the right thing."

"Your circular letter reached me this morning, and I enclose check and note. I should have sent

you my check and note before, immediately after the July number of the JOURNAL, but I was in the Monterey Training Camp and overlooked it."

"I think you are going along a good road. I hope you will find, not three hundred, but every member gifted with the necessary foresight and intelligence to back your proposition."

"I am sending in check and note. I have never had a malpractice suit, but have been so near it that it scared me and cost me more than three years' insurance to settle it quietly. I am talking it to all the men here and surely hope it will go through."

"I consider this a movement in the right direction, and it should have the hearty support of the entire profession."

"Enclosed you will find checks for \$15 and notes for \$15 from Dr. J. C. F. and myself. We believe that this is an excellent movement and should not be allowed to fail through want of plenty of publicity."

"Every member in the State should embrace this proposition. I know there was a time with me when I did not give these matters much thought. I believed that any careful, honest physician could practise indefinitely without anyone taking a crack at his bank roll. I got by for ten years; then away went the old Utopian ideal of the professional life, and but for the masterly and tender care of 'old Judge Morrow' (who will let you weep on his shoulder as often as you want to, God bless him!) I would now be in an untimely grave from worry. Two suits in succession will educate the most skeptical! I can think of no more comforting defense than the State Society—with money."

The former letter was from a member in one of our largest cities; the following one is from a member in a very small town where he is the only physician. "I think the idea a good one and should be heartily endorsed by all members of the Society."

"Please find check and note as per circular just received. Push the plan along. It is too good to fail."

A note was returned to a sender because he had altered the wording and thus destroyed the negotiability of the document. He writes as follows: "Enclosed please find note which I trust will be satisfactory. I plead guilty that the other was not a promissory note. I take great pleasure in this connection to congratulate you upon your untiring efforts toward unity and elevating the standard of the medical fraternity of our State, and wish you continued success in the future."

"I think this insurance indemnity fund a good move and heartily approve of it. Please notify me when the note comes due. With best wishes for the success of the plan, etc."

Here is a word from the secretary of one of our very active county societies. It indicates the tendency on the part of many of our members to delay and procrastinate, which is always dangerous and not infrequently fatal. "I am personally much interested in the indemnity insurance feature, and am doing all I can to stir up interest among our

members; but there seems to be a disposition among the men to hold off until the 300 necessary members is assured."

"Enclose check and note as per circular just received. Hope the good work is progressing satisfactorily and will not fail."

"Enclosed find check for \$15. I have lost the note and if you will tell me how to make one out, I will send it at once. I have been in a company, which costs me \$15 a year, for many years, but I would rather have my money in the hands of our own Society."

"As you know, I am heartily in favor of the idea you are trying to work out and I certainly boost it every time I get an opportunity."

CARREL'S SOLUTION.

Several inquiries have come to this office for the formula of the antiseptic solution which developed as one of the innumerable by-products of the European war. This solution is generally referred to under the name of Carrel's solution, and is made as follows:

Dissolve in a large bottle 140 grams of dry carbonate of soda with 10 liters of sterile water. Add to this 200 grams of chloride of lime (bleaching powder) and shake well. After half an hour siphon off the clear fluid into another bottle through a cotton plug or filter paper and then add 40 grams boric acid to the clear fluid.

ALCOHOL AND PROHIBITION.

The editor of this JOURNAL has had many requests to publish editorially urgent pleas for voting against amendments 1 and 2 at the forthcoming general election. A request equally urgent has also been made to commend prohibition and condemn the use of alcohol. The whole question is another one of those exceedingly broad fundamental problems which confront society. Shall the individual be guided, directed, restrained, modified by governmental authority in all the innumerable ways which sumptuary legislation might devise? Or, on the other hand, shall as great freedom and liberty of conduct be given to the individual as may be consistent with the quiet life, liberty and enjoyment of property of other citizens? Alcohol, like many other things, may be at one time innocent if not useful, while at another time it may be most vicious. In the abuse, and not the sane and proper use, lies the potency for evil of many things, not alone alcohol. Only a fanatic (and the utterances of fanatics must be eliminated from any side of any question) would claim that the moderate use of wine, beer, or other forms of alcohol is harmful. To get back where we started, the whole question is one of policy in social development. One group maintains that the personal activities of all individuals shall be limited, whereas the other group maintains that only the activities of individuals which are harmful to others shall be controlled.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM.

The members of the Scientific Program Committee wish to again call the attention of the members of the State Society to the absolute necessity of making early application for places on the program. They again call attention to the ruling that not only must titles to papers be in the hands of the Program Committee before January, but each author must furnish by that date a synopsis of the paper to be read. These titles and synopses will be published in the JOURNAL before the April meeting. This ruling was made in order to furnish an opportunity for those wishing to take part in discussions to be informed in advance regarding the particular phases of a problem which the author intends to treat in the presentation of his paper. It is felt that only in this way can the greatest good be obtained from discussion.

All members of the State Society in good standing are eligible for a place on the Scientific Program. The privilege of presenting a paper is not the result of a "pull" or of favoritism. The Society belongs to its members and each has a right to be heard on the program or in the discussions. The only thing which can prevent a member of the Society from presenting a paper is the limited amount of time. The actual amount of time allotted for the reading and discussion of papers is two and one-half days. Obviously, each one of the twenty-five hundred members of the Society cannot present a paper. For this reason it is apparent that more will apply for space than can be accommodated. Those who apply early will be given the first opportunity, provided that they comply with the rules laid down and printed in the September number of the JOURNAL.

Below you will find the names of the members of the Committee on Scientific Work and the names of the Chairmen and Secretaries of the various sections:

Program Committee.

Dr. A. B. Grosse, San Francisco, Chairman.
Dr. Harry E. Alderson, San Francisco.
Dr. F. C. E. Mattison, Pasadena.
Dr. R. A. Peers, Colfax, Secretary.

Section Chairmen and Secretaries.

Eye and Ear Section:

Dr. Geo. P. Wintermute, San Francisco.
Dr. B. F. Church, Redlands.

G-U Section:

Dr. Wm. E. Stevens, San Francisco.
Dr. Victor G. Vecki, San Francisco.

Gynecology and Obstetrics Section:

Dr. E. N. Ewer, Oakland.
Dr. A. B. Spalding, San Francisco.

Nervous Diseases and Psychiatry Section:

Dr. Andrew W. Hoisholt, Napa.
Dr. Ross Moore, Los Angeles.